



## **AP<sup>®</sup> Studio Art 2010 Scoring Guidelines**

### **The College Board**

The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the College Board is composed of more than 5,700 schools, colleges, universities and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves seven million students and their parents, 23,000 high schools, and 3,800 colleges through major programs and services in college readiness, college admission, guidance, assessment, financial aid and enrollment. Among its widely recognized programs are the SAT<sup>®</sup>, the PSAT/NMSQT<sup>®</sup>, the Advanced Placement Program<sup>®</sup> (AP<sup>®</sup>), SpringBoard<sup>®</sup> and ACCUPLACER<sup>®</sup>. The College Board is committed to the principles of excellence and equity, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities and concerns.

© 2010 The College Board. College Board, ACCUPLACER, Advanced Placement Program, AP, AP Central, SAT, SpringBoard and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board. Admitted Class Evaluation Service is a trademark owned by the College Board. PSAT/NMSQT is a registered trademark of the College Board and National Merit Scholarship Corporation. All other products and services may be trademarks of their respective owners. Permission to use copyrighted College Board materials may be requested online at: [www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html](http://www.collegeboard.com/inquiry/cbpermit.html).

**Visit the College Board on the Web: [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com).**

**AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: [apcentral.collegeboard.com](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com).**

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

## 2-D Design Portfolio

### General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring guidelines for the AP portfolios contain score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak) and 1 (poor).
- Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.
- Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.
- Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.
- The descriptors are examples; it is not expected that all the descriptors for a scale point will apply to any one particular portfolio.
- The descriptors intentionally discuss general aspects of artwork at each score point; there is no preferred (or unacceptable) content or style.
- The descriptors (taken as a whole) capture characteristics of work that merits each score.
- **This is a living document — one that evolves over time. Though these are the scoring guidelines that were used in 2010, they are always open to subsequent revision.**

### Principles of 2-D Design:

- Unity/Variety
- Balance/Emphasis/Contrast
- Rhythm
- Repetition
- Proportion/Scale
- Figure/Ground Relationships

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

## 2-D Design Quality — Section I

**Five works that demonstrate your mastery of design** — apparent in the composition, concept and execution of the works.

### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. General Use of Design Elements to Investigate the Principles of 2-D Design
- B. Decision Making and Intention in the Compositional Use of the Elements and Principles of Design
- C. Originality, Imagination and Invention
- D. Experimentation and Risk Taking
- E. Confident, Evocative Work and Engagement of the Viewer
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
- G. Appropriation and the Student's "Voice"
- H. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style and process of the work.

### 6 **EXCELLENT QUALITY**

- 6.A In most works there is a highly successful use of the elements of design applied to an investigation of 2-D design principles.
- 6.B The work exhibits well-informed decision making and intention.
- 6.C The composition of the works displays an original, imaginative and inventive articulation of the elements and principles of design.
- 6.D The work may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking.
- 6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
- 6.F The technical competence of the work is generally excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.H There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the five works, but overall the work reaches a level of excellent quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Quality — Section I (continued)

#### **5 STRONG QUALITY**

- 5.A There is generally successful use of the elements of design applied to an investigation of 2-D design principles.
- 5.B The work shows evidence of thoughtful decision making and intention.
- 5.C The work generally demonstrates imaginative ideas and effective manipulation of the elements and principles of design.
- 5.D The work may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking some pieces.
- 5.E Most works exhibit expressive and evocative qualities that engage the viewer and suggest confidence.
- 5.F The technical competence of the work is strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" and individual transformation of the images.
- 5.H There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the five works, but overall the work is of strong quality.

#### **4 GOOD QUALITY**

- 4.A There is successful use of the elements of design, but the investigation of 2-D design principles is limited in scope.
- 4.B Some clear decision making and intention are evident.
- 4.C The composition of the works demonstrates some imaginative ideas and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of design.
- 4.D The work may show engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking or both but with uneven success.
- 4.E Some of the work has evocative qualities that engage the viewer, though confidence is not obvious; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.G With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the images have been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.H There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the five works, but overall the work is of good quality.

#### **3 MODERATE QUALITY**

- 3.A There is some successful use of the elements of design, but the investigation of their application to 2-D design principles is emerging and narrow in scope.
- 3.B Decision making and intention are questionable.
- 3.C Some imaginative ideas about the use of the elements and principles of design appear to be emerging.
- 3.D The work may show attempts at experimentation and/or risk taking, but with limited success.
- 3.E There may be one or two evocative, engaging works; confidence is questionable.
- 3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence and use of materials and media.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Quality — Section I (continued)

- 3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears transformation of the images are minimal.
- 3.H There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the five works; overall the work is of moderate quality.

#### **2 WEAK QUALITY**

- 2.A Some awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, but there appears to be little understanding or investigation of their application to 2-D design principles.
- 2.B Intention is not clear.
- 2.C The work relies heavily on unoriginal ideas and lacks invention or imaginative use of the elements and principles of design.
- 2.D The work shows little attempt at experimentation and/or risk taking, or the experimentation has little success.
- 2.E There is little about the work that is engaging; the work lacks confidence.
- 2.F The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and clumsy use of materials and media.
- 2.G The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average rendering skill, there is little discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 2.H There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the five works, and overall the work is of weak quality.

#### **1 POOR QUALITY**

- 1.A Very little awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, and there appears to be minimal understanding or investigation of their application to 2-D design principles.
- 1.B The work appears to be unconsidered and to lack discernable intention.
- 1.C The work lacks originality or imagination.
- 1.D The work shows negligible experimentation and/or risk taking, or the experimentation is unsuccessful.
- 1.E The work does not engage the viewer; no confidence is evident.
- 1.F The work is generally inept; use of materials is naive and is lacking skill or technical competence.
- 1.G The works are obviously direct, poorly rendered copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.H Overall the five works lack accomplishment and are of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Concentration — Section II

A concentration is defined as “**a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence.**” In scoring concentrations, there are four major areas of concern.

- **Coherence and/or development** — is the work presented actually a concentration?
- **Quality of the concept/idea represented** — is there evidence of thinking and of focus?
- **Degree of development and investigation that is evident in the work** — including the amount of work or number of pieces represented.
- **Quality of the work in both concept and technique.**

**Note:** These four areas will necessarily appear in shifting relationships of relative strength and weakness. Where the four are not even in the level of achievement they represent, they will be considered as a whole to arrive at the score for the section.

Because this section is concerned with a process of growth and discovery, the work presented may span a range of levels of achievement. If this is the case, the higher level that is reached should be acknowledged in the score that is given.

#### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. Integration of the Topic of the Concentration and the Work Presented
- B. Decision Making and Discovery through Investigation
- C. Originality and Innovative Thinking
- D. Evocative Theme and Engagement of the Viewer
- E. Understanding and Application of 2-D Design Principles
- F. Growth and Transformation
- G. Technical Competency and Skill with Materials and Media
- H. Appropriation and the Student’s “Voice”
- I. Image Quality (for weak and poor concentrations only)
- J. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style and process of the work.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Concentration — Section II (continued)

#### **6 EXCELLENT CONCENTRATION**

- 6.A The concentration topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
- 6.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides convincing evidence of informed decision making and discovery.
- 6.C The concentration clearly demonstrates an original vision and innovative ideas and/or risk taking.
- 6.D An evocative, engaging theme is sustained through most of the work within the concentration.
- 6.E The work shows a thorough understanding and effective application of 2-D design principles.
- 6.F In general, the work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G The work conveys a sense of transformation and most works demonstrate a distinct measure of success.
- 6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources of the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.J Accomplishment among the works may vary, but overall the work reaches a level of excellent quality.

#### **5 STRONG CONCENTRATION**

- 5.A The concentration topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
- 5.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in many works.
- 5.C The work for the concentration generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
- 5.D An evocative, engaging concentration theme is clearly present in much of the work.
- 5.E Overall the work shows understanding and effective application of design principles; there may be some less successful pieces.
- 5.F The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G The work generally exhibits transformation and many works demonstrate a measure of success.
- 5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" and individual transformation of the images.
- 5.J There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of strong quality.

#### **4 GOOD CONCENTRATION**

- 4.A The concentration topic and the work presented are closely related.
- 4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the concentration.
- 4.C The concentration demonstrates some originality, and the work shows some innovative thinking.
- 4.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernable.
- 4.E The work is inconsistent in quality, but overall the understanding and application of design principles is good.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Concentration — Section II (continued)

- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.G Apparent transformation is noticeable, but the scope of the work is limited or repetitive.
- 4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the images have been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.J There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of good quality.

#### **3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION**

- 3.A The connection between the concentration topic and the work is evident but erratic.
- 3.B Decision making is sporadic, and the work demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
- 3.C An idea for a concentration is presented, and some original ideas or attempts at innovation with materials and techniques seem to be emerging.
- 3.D A potentially engaging theme is somewhat discernable but is inadequately considered.
- 3.E Some development is evident, but only a moderate understanding and superficial application of design principles are demonstrated.
- 3.F Though uneven, the work demonstrates emerging technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
- 3.G Some transformation is discernable, but the scope of the work is narrow and/or repetitive.
- 3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be nearly direct reproductions; even if skillfully rendered, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
- 3.J There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works; overall the work is of moderate quality.

#### **2 WEAK CONCENTRATION**

- 2.A There is a sense of a concentration, but integration of the topic and the work is inadequately considered.
- 2.B Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.
- 2.C An idea for a concentration is presented, but the ideas in the work are unoriginal or rely mostly on appropriation.
- 2.D A potentially engaging theme is present but is largely unsuccessful.
- 2.E A concentration is evident, but the work shows a weak understanding or random application of design principles.
- 2.F Overall the work demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.
- 2.G The work is mostly repetitive; only a few pieces suggest growth or show slight signs of transformation.
- 2.H The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is little discernable student "voice" or individual transformation.
- 2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted.
- 2.J Little evidence of accomplishment is demonstrated; overall the work is of weak quality.



# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Concentration — Section II (continued)

#### **1 POOR CONCENTRATION**

- 1.A There is very little or no evidence of a concentration topic in the work presented, or there is not enough work to represent a concentration.
- 1.B There is little or no evidence of decision making or investigation.
- 1.C An idea for a concentration may be presented, but the work comprises trite, simplistic or appropriated solutions that are poorly executed.
- 1.D A theme that could engage the viewer with the work is absent.
- 1.E The work shows very little or no understanding of design principles and their application.
- 1.F The work shows very little technical competence; it is naive and lacks skill.
- 1.G Overall the work shows no indication of growth or transformation.
- 1.H The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted.
- 1.J Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Breadth — Section III

A variety of works demonstrating understanding of the principles of design. Look for engagement with a range of design principles:

**Unity/Variety**  
**Rhythm**  
**Proportion/Scale**

**Balance/Emphasis/Contrast**  
**Repetition**  
**Figure/Ground Relationship**

---

#### Key Scoring Descriptors

- A. Broad Investigation of 2-D Design Principles
- B. Originality and Innovative Thinking
- C. Application of 2-D-Design Principles to Broad Range of Design Problems
- D. Purpose and Intention in the Compositional Use of the Elements and Principles of Design
- E. Confident, Evocative Work That Engages the Viewer
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
- G. Appropriation and the Student's "Voice"
- H. Image Quality (for weak and poor breadth sections only)
- I. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style and process of the work.

#### **6 EXCELLENT BREADTH**

- 6.A The work shows an informed investigation of a broad range of 2-D design principles.
- 6.B The work clearly demonstrates original vision, a variety of innovative ideas and/or risk taking and inventive articulation of a broad range of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
- 6.C The work shows an excellent application of 2-D design principles to a broad range of design problems.
- 6.D The work clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or purposes; it articulates multiple insights.
- 6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, verve or nuanced subtlety).
- 6.F The work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.I There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work reaches a level of excellent breadth and quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Breadth — Section III (continued)

#### **5 STRONG BREADTH**

- 5.A The work shows a thoughtful investigation of a range of 2-D design principles.
- 5.B The work demonstrates a range of original, innovative ideas and effective manipulation of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
- 5.C The work shows strong application of 2-D design principles to a range of design problems.
- 5.D The work demonstrates a variety of intentions or purposes; a range of insights is apparent.
- 5.E Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence.
- 5.F The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" and individual transformation of the images.
- 5.I There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of strong breadth and quality.

#### **4 GOOD BREADTH**

- 4.A The work shows a good investigation of a variety of 2-D design principles.
- 4.B The work demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of 2-D design.
- 4.C The work shows good application of 2-D design principles to an acceptable range of design problems.
- 4.D The work shows a variety of intentions and purposes although they may not be clearly articulated.
- 4.E Some of the work has discernable evocative or engaging qualities, though confidence is not strongly apparent; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.G Within the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the images have been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.I There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of good breadth and quality.

#### **3 MODERATE BREADTH**

- 3.A The work shows superficial decision making or discovery, with little sense of an extended investigation into 2-D design principles.
- 3.B Some original ideas seem to be emerging or some attempt at innovation with the elements and principles of 2-D design is evident.
- 3.C The work shows superficial application of 2-D design principles to a limited range of design problems.
- 3.D The work shows a limited range of intention and purpose.
- 3.E The work is emerging in terms of potentially engaging qualities; confidence is questionable.
- 3.F The work demonstrates moderate technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
- 3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be nearly direct reproductions; even if skillfully rendered, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 2-D Design Breadth — Section III (continued)

- 3.I There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works; overall the work is of moderate breadth and quality.

#### **2 WEAK BREADTH**

- 2.A The work shows very little evidence of investigation of a range of 2-D design principles.  
2.B The ideas in the work are unoriginal or rely mostly on appropriation; the work does not show inventive use of the elements and principles of 2-D design.  
2.C The work shows a weak application of 2-D design principles to a very limited range of design problems.  
2.D The work does not clearly articulate a range of intentions or purposes.  
2.E There is little about the work that engages the viewer; the work lacks confidence.  
2.F The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and awkward use of materials and media.  
2.G The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is little discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.  
2.H The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted.  
2.I There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the works; overall the work is of weak breadth and quality.

#### **1 POOR BREADTH**

- 1.A The work shows negligible investigation of a range of 2-D design principles.  
1.B There is no original or imaginative ideation in the work in regard to the elements and principles of 2-D design; the work is comprised of trite, simplistic or appropriated solutions.  
1.C The work shows little or no useful application of 2-D design principles, regardless of the number of problem-solving attempts.  
1.D The work is repetitive in regard to intentions or purposes.  
1.E The work does not engage the viewer; there is no confidence evident in the work.  
1.F The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naive and lacks skill or technical competence.  
1.G The works appear as direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.  
1.H The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; there may too few images to constitute investigation of breadth.  
1.I Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor breadth and quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Portfolio

#### General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring guidelines for the AP portfolios contain score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak) and 1 (poor).
- Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.
- Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.
- Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.
- The descriptors are examples; it is not expected that all the descriptors for a scale point will apply to any one particular portfolio.
- The descriptors intentionally discuss general aspects of artwork at each score point; there is no preferred (or unacceptable) content or style.
- The descriptors (taken as a whole) capture characteristics of work that merits each score.
- **This is a living document — one that evolves over time. Though these are the scoring guidelines that were used in 2010, they are always open to subsequent revision.**

#### Principles of 3-D Design:

- Unity/Variety
- Balance/Emphasis /Contrast
- Rhythm
- Repetition
- Proportion /Scale
- Figure /Ground Relationships

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Quality — Section I

**Digital images of five works (two views of each) that demonstrate mastery**

**of 3-D design** — principles apparent in the form, concept, activation of physical space and execution of the work.

---

#### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. General Use of Design Elements to Investigate the Principles of 3-D Design
- B. Decision Making and Intention in the Activation of Physical Space through the Use of the Elements and Principles of 3-D Design
- C. Originality, Imagination and Invention
- D. Experimentation and Risk Taking
- E. Confident, Evocative Work and the Engagement of the Viewer
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
- G. Appropriation and the Student's "Voice"
- H. Image Quality (for weak and poor quality sections only)
- I. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style and process of the work.

#### **6 EXCELLENT QUALITY**

- 6.A The elements of design are used successfully in most of the works to investigate 3-D design principles.
- 6.B The work exhibits well-informed decision making and intention in the activation of physical space.
- 6.C The works clearly display original, imaginative ideas and inventive articulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 6.D The work may show very successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking.
- 6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative: it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
- 6.F The technical competence of the work is excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.I There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the five works, but overall, the work reaches a level of excellent quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Quality — Section I (continued)

#### **5 STRONG QUALITY**

- 5.A There is generally successful use of the elements of design applied to an investigation of 3-D design principles.
- 5.B The work shows evidence of thoughtful decision making and intention in the activation of physical space.
- 5.C The work generally demonstrates imaginative ideas and effective manipulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 5.D The work may show successful engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking.
- 5.E Most works exhibit expressive and evocative qualities that engage the viewer and suggest confidence.
- 5.F The technical competence of the work is strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" and individual transformation of the work.
- 5.I There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the five works, but overall, they demonstrate strong quality.

#### **4 GOOD QUALITY**

- 4.A There is successful use of the elements of design, but the investigation of 3-D design principles is limited in scope.
- 4.B Some clear decision making and intention are evident in the activation of physical space.
- 4.C The works demonstrate some imaginative ideas and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 4.D The work may show engagement with experimentation and/or risk taking but with uneven success.
- 4.E Some of the work has evocative qualities that engage the viewer, though confidence is not strongly perceptible; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas may not always work together.
- 4.G With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the work has been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.I There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the five works, but overall they demonstrate good quality.

#### **3 MODERATE QUALITY**

- 3.A There is some successful use of the elements of design, but an investigation of their application to 3-D design principles is emerging and narrow in scope.
- 3.B Decision making and intention in the work are limited, and the work shows little knowledge about the activation of physical space.
- 3.C Some imaginative ideas about the use of the elements and principles of 3-D design appear to be emerging.
- 3.D The work may show an attempt at experimentation and/or risk taking, but with limited success.
- 3.E There may be one or two evocative, engaging works; confidence is questionable.
- 3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence and use of materials and media.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Quality — Section I (continued)

- 3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be similar fabrications; even if skillfully duplicated, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the work are minimal.
- 3.I There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the five works; overall they demonstrate moderate quality.

#### **2 WEAK QUALITY**

- 2.A Some awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, but there appears to be little understanding or investigation of their application to 3-D design principles.
- 2.B Intention is not clear.
- 2.C The work relies heavily on unoriginal ideas and lacks invention or imaginative use of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 2.D The work shows little attempt at experimentation and/or risk taking, or the experimentation has little success.
- 2.E There is little about the work that is engaging; the work lacks confidence.
- 2.F The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and clumsy use of materials and media.
- 2.G The works appear to be direct fabrications of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average skill, there is little discernable student "voice" or individual transformation.
- 2.H The images are difficult to see because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; the two views convey basically the same information, or only one view is provided.
- 2.I There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the five works, and overall they are of weak quality.

#### **1 POOR QUALITY**

- 1.A Very little awareness of the elements of design is demonstrated, and there appears to be minimal understanding or investigation of their application to 3-D design principles.
- 1.B The work appears to be unconsidered and to lack discernable intention.
- 1.C The work lacks originality or imagination.
- 1.D The work shows negligible experimentation and/or risk taking, or the experimentation is unsuccessful.
- 1.E The work does not engage the viewer; no confidence is evident.
- 1.F The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naive and is lacking skill or technical competence.
- 1.G The works are obviously direct, poorly fabricated copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; there is no discernable student "voice" or individual transformation.
- 1.H The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; two views may be lacking.
- 1.I Overall, the five works lack accomplishment and are of poor quality.



# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Concentration — Section II

A concentration is defined as “**a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence.**” In scoring concentrations, there are four major areas of concern.

- **Coherence and/or development** — is the work presented actually a concentration?
- **Quality of the concept/idea represented** — is there evidence of thinking and of focus?
- **Degree of development and investigation that is evident in the work** — including the amount of work or number of pieces represented.
- **Quality of the work in both concept and technique.**

**Note:** These four areas will necessarily appear in shifting relationships of relative strength and weakness. Where the four are not even in the level of achievement they represent, they will be considered as a whole to arrive to the score for the section.

Because this section is concerned with a process of growth and discovery, the work presented may span a range of levels of achievement. If this is the case, the higher level that is reached should be acknowledged in the score that is given.

---

#### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. Integration of the Topic of the Concentration and the Work Presented
- B. Decision Making and Discovery through Investigation
- C. Originality and Innovative Thinking
- D. Evocative Theme and Engagement of the Viewer
- E. Activation of Physical Space through Understanding and Application of 3-D Design Principles
- F. Growth and Transformation
- G. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
- H. Appropriation and the Student’s “Voice”
- I. Image Quality (for weak and poor quality sections only)
- J. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style and process of the work.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Concentration — Section II (continued)

#### **6 EXCELLENT CONCENTRATION**

- 6.A The concentration topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
- 6.B The investigation of the concentration provides convincing evidence of informed decision making and discovery.
- 6.C The concentration clearly demonstrates an original vision and innovative ideas and/or risk taking.
- 6.D An evocative, engaging theme is sustained through most of the work.
- 6.E The work shows a thorough understanding and effective application of 3-D design principles to activate physical space.
- 6.F The work conveys a sense of transformation and most works demonstrate a distinct measure of success.
- 6.G In general, the work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas and the work clearly demonstrates expertise with most needed skills.
- 6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.J Accomplishment among the works may vary, but overall, the work reaches a level of excellent quality.

#### **5 STRONG CONCENTRATION**

- 5.A The concentration topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
- 5.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in some works.
- 5.C The work for the concentration generally demonstrates original and innovative ideas.
- 5.D An evocative, engaging concentration theme is clearly present in much of the work.
- 5.E Overall the work shows a strong understanding and effective application of 3-D design principles to activate physical space; there may be some less successful pieces.
- 5.F The work generally exhibits transformation and many works demonstrate a measure of success.
- 5.G In general, the work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas, and expertise with some skills is evident.
- 5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" and individual transformation of the work.
- 5.J There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of strong quality.

#### **4 GOOD CONCENTRATION**

- 4.A The concentration topic and the work presented are closely related.
- 4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the concentration.
- 4.C The concentration demonstrates some originality, and the work shows some innovative thinking.
- 4.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernable.
- 4.E The work is inconsistent in quality, but overall the understanding and application of design principles activates physical space.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Concentration — Section II (continued)

- 4.F Apparent growth and transformation are noticeable but the scope of the work is limited or repetitive.
- 4.G The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media, as well as a developing expertise with skills; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the work has been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.J There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of good quality.

### **3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION**

- 3.A The connection between the concentration topic and the work is evident, but erratic.
- 3.B Decision making is sporadic and the work of the concentration demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
- 3.C An idea for a concentration is presented and some original ideas or attempts at innovation with materials and techniques seem to be emerging.
- 3.D A potentially engaging theme is somewhat discernable, but it is inadequately considered.
- 3.E Some development is evident, but only a moderate understanding and superficial application of design principles to activate physical space are demonstrated.
- 3.F Some transformation is discernable but the scope of the work is narrow and/or repetitive.
- 3.G Though uneven, the work demonstrates emerging technical competence and some knowledgeable use of materials and media.
- 3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be similar fabrications; even if skillfully duplicated, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the work are minimal.
- 3.J There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works; overall the work is of moderate quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Concentration — Section II (continued)

#### **2 WEAK CONCENTRATION**

- 2.A There is a sense of a concentration, but integration of the topic and the work is inadequately considered.
- 2.B Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.
- 2.C An idea for a concentration is presented, but the ideas in the work are unoriginal or rely mostly on appropriation.
- 2.D A potentially engaging theme is present but is largely unsuccessful.
- 2.E A concentration is evident, but the work shows a weak understanding and random application of design principles; physical space is not fully activated.
- 2.F The work is mostly repetitive; only a few pieces suggest growth or show slight signs of transformation.
- 2.G Overall, the work demonstrates marginal technical competence, awkward use of materials and media, and minimal skills.
- 2.H The works appear to be direct fabrications of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are of average skill; there is little discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; any details provide no useful information about the objects or installation.
- 2.J There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the works, and overall the work is of weak quality.

#### **1 POOR CONCENTRATION**

- 1.A There is very little or no evidence of a concentration topic in the work presented or there is not enough work to represent a concentration.
- 1.B An idea for a concentration may be presented but the knowledge and understanding to investigate and carry it out are not evident in the work.
- 1.C A clear idea for a concentration may be presented, but the work comprises trite, simplistic or appropriated solutions that are poorly executed.
- 1.D A theme that could engage the viewer with the work in relation to the concentration is absent.
- 1.E The work shows very little or no understanding of design principles and their application; physical space is poorly activated.
- 1.F Overall the work shows no indication of growth or transformation.
- 1.G The work shows very little technical competence; it is naive and lacks skill.
- 1.H The works are apparently direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are poorly fabricated; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; any details provide no additional information about the objects or installation.
- 1.J Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Breadth — Section III

A variety of works demonstrating understanding of the principles of design. Look for engagement with a range of **design principles**:

**Unity/Variety**

**Rhythm**

**Proportion/Scale**

**Balance/Emphasis/Contrast**

**Repetition**

**Figure/Ground Relationship**

---

#### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. Broad Investigation of 3-D Design Principles
- B. Originality and Innovative Thinking
- C. Understanding and Application of 3-D-Design Principles through a Broad Range of Problem Solving
- D. Purpose and Intention in the Activation of Physical Space through the Use of the Elements and Principles of 3-D Design
- E. Confident, Evocative Work That Engages the Viewer
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
- G. Appropriation and the Student's "Voice"
- H. Image Quality (for weak and poor breadth sections only)
- I. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style and process of the work.

#### **6 EXCELLENT BREADTH**

- 6.A The work shows an informed investigation of a range of 3-D design principles.
- 6.B The work clearly demonstrates original vision, a variety of innovative ideas and/or risk taking, and inventive articulation of a broad range of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 6.C The work shows an excellent application of 3-D design principles to a broad range of design problems.
- 6.D The work clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space; it articulates multiple insights.
- 6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, verve or nuanced subtlety).
- 6.F The technical competence of the work is excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas, and a mastery of skills is demonstrated at an high level.
- 6.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Breadth — Section III (continued)

- 6.I There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the works, but overall, the work reaches a level of excellent breadth and quality.

#### **5 STRONG BREADTH**

- 5.A The work shows thoughtful investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.
- 5.B The work clearly demonstrates a range of original and innovative ideas and effective manipulation of a broad range of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 5.C The work shows strong application of 3-D design principles to a range of design problems.
- 5.D The work demonstrates a variety of intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space; a range of insights is apparent.
- 5.E Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence.
- 5.F The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas, and expertise with some skills is evident.
- 5.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" and individual transformation of the work.
- 5.I There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of strong breadth and quality.

#### **4 GOOD BREADTH**

- 4.A The work shows a clear investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.
- 4.B The work demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking and purposeful manipulation of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 4.C The work shows good application of 3-D design principles to an acceptable range of design problems.
- 4.D The work shows a variety of intentions and purposes in the activation of physical space; they may not be clearly articulated.
- 4.E Some of the work has discernable evocative or engaging qualities, though confidence is not strongly apparent; conversely the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas may not always work together.
- 4.G With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the work has been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.I There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work is of good breadth and quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Breadth — Section III (continued)

#### **3 MODERATE BREADTH**

- 3.A The work shows a superficial investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.
- 3.B Some original ideas seem to be emerging or some attempt at innovation with the elements and principles of 3-D design is evident.
- 3.C The work shows superficial application of 3-D design principles to a limited range of design problems.
- 3.D The work shows a limited range of intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space.
- 3.E The work is beginning to emerge in terms of potentially engaging qualities; confidence is questionable.
- 3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence, some knowledgeable use of materials and media, and rudimentary skills.
- 3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be similar fabrications; although skillfully duplicated, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the work are minimal.
- 3.I There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works; overall the work is of moderate breadth and quality.

#### **2 WEAK BREADTH**

- 2.A The work shows very little evidence of an investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.
- 2.B The ideas in the work are unoriginal or rely mostly on appropriation; the work does not show inventive use of the elements and principles of 3-D design.
- 2.C The work shows a weak application of 3-D design principles to a very limited range of design problems.
- 2.D The work does not clearly show a range of intentions or purpose in the activation of physical space.
- 2.E There is little about the work that engages the viewer; the work lacks confidence.
- 2.F The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence, clumsy use of materials and media and minimal skills.
- 2.G The works appear to be direct fabrications of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are of average skill; there is little discernable student "voice" or individual transformation.
- 2.H The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; the two views convey basically the same information, or only one view is provided.
- 2.I There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the works, and overall the work is of weak breadth and quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### 3-D Design Breadth — Section III (continued)

#### **1 POOR BREADTH**

- 1.A The work shows negligible investigation of a range of 3-D design problems.
- 1.B There is little original or imaginative ideation in the work in regard to the elements and principles of 3-D design; the work is comprised of trite, simplistic or appropriated solutions.
- 1.C The work shows very little or no useful application of 3-D design principles regardless of the number of problem-solving attempts.
- 1.D The work is repetitive in regard to intentions or purposes in the activation of physical space.
- 1.E The work does not engage the viewer; there is no confidence evident in the work.
- 1.F The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naive and is lacking in skill or technical competence.
- 1.G The works are apparently direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists and are poorly fabricated; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.H The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; there may be an incomplete set of images.
- 1.I Overall the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor breadth and quality.



# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

## Drawing Portfolio

### General information and a few provisos:

- The scoring guidelines for the AP portfolios contain score points from 6 (excellent) through 5 (strong), 4 (good), 3 (moderate), 2 (weak) and 1 (poor).
- Each score point is characterized by a variety of descriptors of work that would receive that score.
- Because there are only six different points on the scale, each score point represents a band or range of accomplishment.
- Some of the descriptors may seem to contradict each other because the range of possibilities for work at a given score point is so great.
- The descriptors are examples; it is not expected that all the descriptors for a scale point will apply to any one particular portfolio.
- The descriptors intentionally discuss general aspects of artwork at each score point; there is no preferred (or unacceptable) content or style.
- The descriptors (taken as a whole) capture characteristics of work that merits each score.
- **This is a living document — one that evolves over time. Though these are the scoring guidelines that were used in 2010, they are always open to subsequent revision.**

**Drawing Concepts and Skills** include, but are not limited to:

- Light and Shade
- Rendering of Form
- Composition
- Surface Manipulation
- Illusion of Depth
- Mark-Making

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

## Drawing Quality — Section I

**Five actual works that demonstrate mastery of drawing** — apparent in the composition, concept and execution of the works

### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. Understanding of Composition, Concept and Execution
- B. Intention or Purpose
- C. Originality, Imagination and Invention in Using the Elements and Principles of Design in Drawing  
Composition
- D. Decision Making, Experimentation and/or Risk Taking.
- E. Confident, Evocative Work That Engages the Viewer
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Drawing Materials and Media
- G. Understanding the Use of Digital or Photographic Sources
- H. Appropriation and the Student's "Voice"
- I. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, mark-making and use of media in the work.

### **6 EXCELLENT QUALITY**

- 6.A The work demonstrates excellent understanding of drawing through advanced visual concepts, resolved composition and generally excellent execution.
- 6.B Through a successful integration of form with content, the viewer easily comprehends the intention or purpose of the work.
- 6.C The work clearly displays imaginative ideas and successful, inventive articulation of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.
- 6.D The work shows well-informed decision making that involves successful experimentation and/or risk taking in most pieces.
- 6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative: it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
- 6.F The technical competence of the work is consistently excellent; drawing materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a sophisticated understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.I There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the five drawings, but overall the work reaches a level of excellent quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Quality — Section I (continued)

#### **5 STRONG QUALITY**

- 5.A The work demonstrates strong understanding of drawing through involved visual concepts, well-structured composition and generally successful execution.
- 5.B Through a clear relationship between form and content, the viewer is aware of the general intention or purpose of the work.
- 5.C The work shows imaginative ideas and effective manipulation of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.
- 5.D The work shows thoughtful decision making that involves successful experimentation and/or risk taking in many pieces.
- 5.E Most works exhibit expressive and evocative qualities that engage the viewer and suggest confidence.
- 5.F The technical competence of the work is strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a strong understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 5.I There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the five drawings, but overall the work is of strong quality.

#### **4 GOOD QUALITY**

- 4.A The work demonstrates a good understanding of drawing through basic visual concepts, thoughtful composition and good execution.
- 4.B An effort to integrate form and content is evident, although the intent or purpose of the work may not be clear to the viewer.
- 4.C The work demonstrates some imaginative ideas and purposeful manipulation of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.
- 4.D The work shows some clear decision making that may involve experimentation and/or risk taking, but with uneven success.
- 4.E Some of the work has evocative qualities that will engage the viewer, though confidence is not obvious; conversely, the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of drawing materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a good understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the images have been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.I There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the five drawings, but overall the work demonstrates good quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Quality — Section I (continued)

#### **3 MODERATE QUALITY**

- 3.A The work demonstrates a moderate understanding of drawing through foundational visual concepts with moderately successful compositional resolution and execution.
- 3.B The relationship of form to content is beginning to come into focus, but intention and purpose are uncertain.
- 3.C Some imaginative ideas about use of the principles of design in the drawing compositions appear to be emerging.
- 3.D The work shows limited decision making, experimentation and/or risk taking; there may be some limited success.
- 3.E There may be one or two evocative, engaging works; confidence is questionable.
- 3.F The work is uneven, but overall it demonstrates emerging technical competence and use of materials and media.
- 3.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays a basic understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be nearly direct reproductions; even if skillfully rendered, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
- 3.I There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the five drawings; overall the work is of moderate quality.

#### **2 WEAK QUALITY**

- 2.A The work demonstrates a weak understanding of drawing; few visual concepts are considered; compositional resolution is erratic, and overall execution is awkward.
- 2.B The relationship of form to content is inadequately considered; intention or purpose is ambiguous.
- 2.C The work relies heavily upon unimaginative and weakly articulated ideas about the use of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.
- 2.D Decision making in the work is limited to conventional solutions; there is little or no attempt at experimentation; lack of knowledge inhibits risk taking.
- 2.E There is little about the work in terms of content, style or process that will engage the viewer; the work lacks confidence.
- 2.F The work demonstrates weak technical competence, awkward use of drawing materials and media and minimal mark-making skills.
- 2.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays a weak understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 2.H The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average rendering skill, there is little discernable student "voice" or individual transformation.
- 2.I There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the five drawings, and overall the work is of weak quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Quality — Section I (continued)

#### **1 POOR QUALITY**

- 1.A The work demonstrates little understanding of drawing, visual concepts or composition; overall the execution is naive and clumsy.
- 1.B The relationship of form to content is unconsidered; intention or purpose is lacking.
- 1.C The work lacks imaginative or inventive ideas about the use of the principles of design in the drawing compositions.
- 1.D Thoughtful decision making in the work is not apparent; there is no experimentation; lack of knowledge precludes any risk taking.
- 1.E The work does not engage the viewer; no confidence is evident.
- 1.F The work is generally inept; use of drawing materials and media is naive and is lacking in mark-making skills and technical competence.
- 1.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays no understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 1.H The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists that are poorly rendered; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.I Overall the five drawings lack accomplishment and are of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Concentration — Section II

A concentration is defined as “**a body of work unified by an underlying idea that has visual coherence**.” In scoring concentrations, there are four major areas of concern.

- **Coherence and/or development**—is the work presented actually a concentration?
- **Quality of the concept/idea represented**—is there evidence of thinking and of focus?
- **Degree of development and investigation that is evident in the work**—including the amount of work or number of pieces represented
- **Quality of the work in both concept and technique**

**Note:** These four areas will necessarily appear in **shifting relationships of relative strength and weakness**. Where the four are not even in the level of achievement they represent, they will be **considered as a whole** to arrive to the score for the section.

Because this section is concerned with a process of growth and discovery, **the work presented may span a range of levels of achievement**. If this is the case, **the higher level that is reached should be acknowledged** in the score that is given.

#### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. Integration of the Topic of the Concentration and the Work Presented
- B. Decision Making and Discovery through Investigation
- C. Originality and Innovative Thinking
- D. Evocative Theme That Engages the Viewer
- E. Growth and Transformation
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Materials and Media
- G. Understanding the Use of Digital or Photographic Processes
- H. Appropriation and the Student’s “Voice”
- I. Image Quality (for weak and poor concentrations only)
- J. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, mark-making and use of media in the work.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Concentration — Section II (continued)

#### **6 EXCELLENT CONCENTRATION**

- 6.A The concentration topic and the work presented are unmistakably and coherently integrated.
- 6.B The investigation of the concentration topic provides convincing evidence of informed decision making and discovery.
- 6.C The work for the concentration clearly demonstrates an original vision, innovative ideas and/or risk taking, and inventive articulation of drawing techniques.
- 6.D An evocative, engaging theme is sustained through most of the work.
- 6.E The work conveys a sense of transformation and most works demonstrate a distinct measure of successful drawing.
- 6.F In general, the work is technically excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a sophisticated understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 6.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.J There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the works for the concentration, but overall the work reaches a level of excellent quality.

#### **5 STRONG CONCENTRATION**

- 5.A The concentration topic is successfully integrated with most of the work presented.
- 5.B The investigation of the concentration provides evidence of thoughtful decision making and of discovery in some works.
- 5.C The work for the concentration generally demonstrates originality, innovative thinking and effective manipulation of drawing techniques.
- 5.D An evocative, engaging theme is clearly present in much of the work.
- 5.E The work generally exhibits transformation but some pieces are not fully realized or totally successful.
- 5.F The work is technically strong; materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a strong understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 5.H Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" through individual transformation of the images.
- 5.J There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works for the concentration, but overall the work is of strong quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Concentration — Section II (continued)

#### **4 GOOD CONCENTRATION**

- 4.A The concentration topic and the work presented are closely related.
- 4.B Some clear decision making and discovery are evident in the investigation of the concentration.
- 4.C The work for the concentration demonstrates some originality, some innovative thinking and purposeful manipulation of drawing techniques.
- 4.D A clear theme that engages the viewer with some of the work is discernable.
- 4.E Apparent transformation is noticeable, but the scope of the work may be limited or repetitive.
- 4.F The work demonstrates adequate technical competence and use of materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work employs a good understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 4.H With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the images have been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.J There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works for the concentration, but overall the work is of good quality.

#### **3 MODERATE CONCENTRATION**

- 3.A The connection between the concentration topic and the work presented is evident but erratic.
- 3.B Decision making is sporadic and the work demonstrates little sense of investigation or discovery.
- 3.C An idea for a concentration is presented and some original ideas seem to be emerging or some attempt at innovation with drawing techniques is evident.
- 3.D A potentially engaging theme is somewhat discernable, but it is inadequately considered.
- 3.E Some transformation is discernable but the scope of the work is narrow and/or repetitive.
- 3.F Though uneven, the work demonstrates emerging technical competence, some knowledgeable use of drawing materials and media, and rudimentary drawing skills.
- 3.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays a basic understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 3.H If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be nearly direct reproductions; even if skillfully rendered, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
- 3.J There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works for the concentration; overall the work is of moderate quality.

#### **2 WEAK CONCENTRATION**

- 2.A There is a sense of a concentration, but integration of the topic and the work is inadequately considered.
- 2.B Decision making is lacking; the work appears inadequately thought out and insufficiently explored.
- 2.C An idea for a concentration is presented, but the ideas in the work are unoriginal or rely mostly on appropriation.
- 2.D A potentially engaging theme is present but is generally unsuccessful.
- 2.E The work is mostly repetitive; only a few pieces suggest growth or show slight signs of transformation.



# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Concentration — Section II (continued)

- 2.F The work demonstrates poor technical competence, awkward use of drawing materials and media and poor drawing skills.
- 2.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays a weak understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 2.H The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average rendering skill, there is little discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted.
- 2.J There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the works for the concentration; overall the work is of weak quality.

#### **1 POOR CONCENTRATION**

- 1.A There is very little or no evidence of a concentration topic in the work presented or there is not enough work to represent a concentration.
- 1.B An idea for a concentration may be presented but the knowledge and understanding to investigate and carry it out are not evident in the work.
- 1.C An idea for a concentration may be presented, but the work is comprised of trite, simplistic or appropriated solutions that are poorly drawn
- 1.D A theme that could engage the viewer with the work in relation to the concentration is absent.
- 1.E Overall the work shows no indication of growth or transformation.
- 1.F The work shows very limited technical competence; use of materials and media is naive and is lacking in drawing skills.
- 1.G When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays no understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 1.H The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists that are poorly rendered; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted.
- 1.J Overall the work for the concentration lacks accomplishment and is of poor quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

## Drawing Breadth — Section III

Works demonstrating understanding of a variety drawing issues. Look for engagement with a range of:

**Form**  
**Content**  
**Tonal values**  
**Line quality**  
**Perspective and other spatial systems**  
**Composition**

**Drawing surface**  
**Depth**  
**Pattern**  
**Means of representation and abstraction**  
**Materials**  
**Techniques**  
**Styles and so on**

---

### Key Scoring Descriptors:

- A. Investigation of a Broad Range of Visual Concepts and Composition
- B. Decision Making in Terms of Experimentation and/or Risk Taking
- C. Originality, Imagination, and Invention in Using the Elements and Principles of Design in Drawing Composition
- D. Intention, Purpose and Direction
- E. Confident, Evocative Work that Engages the Viewer
- F. Technical Competence and Skill with Drawing Materials and Media
- G. Understanding the Use of Digital or Photographic Sources
- H. Appropriation and the Student's "Voice"
- I. Image Quality (for weak and poor breadth sections only)
- J. Overall Accomplishment and Quality

In applying these descriptors, consider the content, style, mark-making and use of media in the work.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Breadth — Section III (continued)

#### **6 EXCELLENT BREADTH**

- 6.A The work demonstrates informed investigation of a broad range of visual concepts and compositions.
- 6.B The work exhibits obvious evidence of informed decision making that involves highly successful experimentation and/or risk taking in most pieces.
- 6.C The work clearly displays an imaginative and inventive articulation of the principles of design in a broad range of drawing compositions.
- 6.D Through a successful balance of form and content, the work clearly demonstrates a broad range of intentions or purposes.
- 6.E The work as a whole is confident and evocative; it engages the viewer with visual qualities (for example, expressive verve or nuanced subtlety).
- 6.F The technical competence of the work is consistently excellent; materials and media are used effectively to express ideas.
- 6.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists clearly provides a visual reference that is transformed in the service of a larger, personal vision in which the student's "voice" is prominent.
- 6.H When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a sophisticated understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 6.J There may be a varying range of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work demonstrates excellent breadth and quality.

#### **5 STRONG BREADTH**

- 5.A The work demonstrates thoughtful investigation of a range of visual concepts and compositions.
- 5.B The work shows evidence of decision making that involves successful experimentation and/or risk taking in many pieces.
- 5.C The work demonstrates innovative ideas through the effective manipulation of the principles of design in a range of drawing compositions.
- 5.D Through a clear relationship of form and content, the work articulates a variety of intentions or purposes.
- 5.E Most of the work engages the viewer with expressive and evocative qualities; the work suggests confidence.
- 5.F The technical competence of the work is strong; drawing materials and media are used well to express ideas.
- 5.G Any apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists shows a strong sense of the student's "voice" through individual transformation of the images.
- 5.H When digital or photographic processes are used, the work incorporates a strong understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 5.J There may be varying levels of accomplishment among the works, but overall the work demonstrates strong breadth and quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Breadth — Section III (continued)

#### **4 GOOD BREADTH**

- 4.A The work demonstrates a good investigation of varied visual concepts and compositions.
- 4.B The work shows decision making and may show evidence of experimentation and/or risk taking that is not always successful.
- 4.C The work demonstrates somewhat innovative ideas through purposeful attempts to manipulate the principles of design in a range of drawing compositions.
- 4.D The relationship of form to content is evident; a range of intended purposes or directions may not be clearly articulated.
- 4.E Some of the work has discernable evocative or engaging qualities, though confidence is not strongly apparent; conversely the work may display confidence but not be engaging.
- 4.F The work demonstrates good technical competence and use of drawing materials and media; technical aspects and articulation of ideas do not always work together.
- 4.G With the apparent appropriation of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists, the student's "voice" is discernable; the images have been manipulated to express the student's individual ideas.
- 4.H When digital or photographic processes are used, the work employs a good understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 4.J There may be uneven levels of accomplishment among the works but overall the work demonstrates good breadth and quality.

#### **3 MODERATE BREADTH**

- 3.A The work demonstrates a moderate investigation of a range of visual concepts and/or compositions.
- 3.B The work shows modest decision making; there is little evidence of successful experimentation and/or risk taking.
- 3.C The work demonstrates a few imaginative ideas or ideas that are tentative in their innovation with the principles of design.
- 3.D The relationship of form to content is beginning to come into focus, but there is obvious uncertainty of purpose and direction.
- 3.E The work is emerging in terms of potentially engaging qualities confidence is questionable.
- 3.F The work demonstrates moderate technical competence and some knowledgeable use of drawing materials and media.
- 3.G If published or photographic sources or the work of other artists are appropriated, the work appears to be nearly direct reproductions; even if skillfully rendered, the student's "voice" and the individual transformation of the images are minimal.
- 3.H When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays a basic understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 3.J There may be an emerging level of accomplishment among the works; overall the work is of moderate breadth and quality.

# AP<sup>®</sup> STUDIO ART

## 2010 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Drawing Breadth — Section III (continued)

#### **2 WEAK BREADTH**

- 2.A The work shows very little evidence of the investigation of a range of visual concepts or compositions.
- 2.B The work shows decision making that is limited to conventional solutions; there is little or no successful experimentation and/or risk taking.
- 2.C The work primarily shows appropriated or weakly articulated ideas about the use of the principles of design in relation to drawing composition.
- 2.D The relationship of form to content is ambiguous, and few of the works demonstrate a clear intention, purpose or direction.
- 2.E There is little about the work that is engaging; the work lacks confidence.
- 2.F The work is generally awkward; it demonstrates marginal technical competence and clumsy use of materials and media.
- 2.G The works appear to be direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists; even if they are of average rendering skill, there is little discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 2.H When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays a weak understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 2.I The images are difficult to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted.
- 2.J There is little evidence of accomplishment demonstrated in the works; overall the work is of weak breadth and quality.

#### **1 POOR BREADTH**

- 1.A The work shows negligible investigation of a range of visual concepts or compositions.
- 1.B The work lacks evidence of decision making; no experimentation is evident.
- 1.C The work shows no imaginative or inventive ideas about the relation of the principles of design to drawing composition.
- 1.D The relationship of form to content is unrealized; the work demonstrates little or no intention, purpose or direction.
- 1.E The work does not engage the viewer; there is no confidence evident in the work.
- 1.F The work is generally inept; use of materials and media is naive and lacks skill or technical competence.
- 1.G The works are obviously direct copies of published or photographic sources or the work of other artists that are poorly rendered; there is no discernable student “voice” or individual transformation.
- 1.H When digital or photographic processes are used, the work displays no understanding of the application of analog drawing concepts and techniques.
- 1.I The images are impossible to see properly because they are too small, unfocused or poorly lighted; there may be an incomplete set of images.
- 1.J Overall, the work lacks accomplishment and is of poor breadth and quality.